



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/447,717	05/23/95	STEWART	R 10915R

LAW AND OPERATIONS
SARNOFF CORPORATION
CN 5300
PRINCETON NJ 08543-5300

LM61/0202

EXAMINER
LUU, M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2775	

DATE MAILED: 02/02/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/447,717

Applicant(s)

STEWART

Examiner

LUU

Group Art Unit

1775

19

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on January 26, 1999 (Examiner's Amendment).
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-12, 14-16, 20, 22, 25, 27 and 30-32 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 14-16 and 30-32 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 8, 10-12, 20, 22, 25 and 27 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2775

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Applicant's admitted prior art (Fig. 1).

Regarding claims 8 and 20, the Applicant admitted prior art (Fig. 1) of U.S. Patent No. (5,302,966) discloses all the claimed subject matter. See also column 2, lines 35-48.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2775

4. Claims 22, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (Fig. 1).

Regarding claims 22, 25 and 27, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 20, the only difference between the admitted prior art (Fig. 1) and the claimed invention is that the claims require the using number of digital bits to represent the number of gray scale levels. However, it was well-known in the art that in a flat panel display device a 4 bits data being used to provide $4^2=16$ levels of gray scale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Koenck et al (5,576,601).

Regarding claims 10-12, the only differences between the disclosure of the admitted prior art and the claimed invention is that the claimed requires the voltage supply is a linear ramp or a step function.

However, Koenck et al from the same field on endeavor discloses (Fig. 6) the voltage supply is a linear ramp or a step function. See column 2, lines 41-43. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the power supply voltage of a ramp function in the Electroluminescent (EL) panel of the Admitted prior art to provide an EL panel wherein the power supply can be easily adjustable to provide sufficient power to the EL panel.

Art Unit: 2775

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1-7, 14-16 and 30-31 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8, 10-12 and 14-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Sakamoto et al (5,262,766) discloses (Fig. 3) a display unit having a ramp voltage wave form.

-Corrigan, III (5,559,402) discloses a power circuit with energy recovery for driving an EL device.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Matthew Luu at telephone number (703) 305-4850.

M. Luu: *W.L.*

January 27, 1999



**MATTHEW LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Art Unit: 2775

#19/E
Tuck
01-27-99

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

-Claim ~~8~~, line 20, delete the word "stored".

-Claim 10, change the number "10" to -- 8 --.

-Claim ~~11~~, change the number "9" to -- 8 --.

2. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Mr. Raymond R. Moser Jr. on January 26, 1999.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Matthew Luu at telephone number (703) 305-4850.

M. Luu: M.L.

January 26, 1999

Matthew Luu

MATTHEW LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER